

**Soviet Anti-Semitism****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution urging that the United States, through its delegation at the United Nations, take forthright steps in securing a world condemnation of anti-Semitism.

This resolution specifies that this universal ban must be in treaty form, and that all signatory states must pledge themselves to eradicate anti-Semitism within their territories and establish mutual enforcement measures.

I believe such an achievement will contribute much toward our goal of ending the overt and covert manifestations of anti-Semitism which still fester in the world.

I should like to congratulate the distinguished participants of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, which met earlier this week here in Washington. This meeting has served us all in drawing attention to the flagrant abuses prevailing in the Soviet Union.

The able and distinguished Senator from New York, JACOB K. JAVITS, spoke to the gathering only yesterday, and his timely comments on the situation are crucially relevant.

Under unanimous consent, I include the speech of Senator JAVITS, given at the Hotel Willard in Washington on April 6, be inserted at this point in the Record, as follows:

**SILENT DIPLOMACY WILL NOT SAVE SOVIET JEWS**

(By Senator JACOB JAVITS)

Events over the Passover holiday demonstrate the relentless character of the Soviet Union's campaign of repression against the Jewish minority in the U.S.S.R. But they also show that the regime in the U.S.S.R. is not impervious to the protests of the world on this issue. Both are vitally important conclusions.

That anti-Jewish repression continues was shown when on the eve of the Passover holiday the Kremlin went out of its way to prevent Jews from obtaining matzoth in time by impounding 2,000, 10-pound packages of matzoth paid for and sent with full import clearances prepaid by Americans in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Los Angeles to relatives and friends in the Soviet Union.

In response to representations by the U.S. Embassy in Moscow made at my request, the Soviets explained that packages from individuals to individuals were delivered and only those sent by organizations were returned; it was also claimed that matzoth were available in the U.S.S.R. to all who wanted them. But this explanation was contradicted by reports in the Soviet press itself before the beginning of the Passover festival on March 27 on the nondelivery of the parcels and the advice of Moscow's chief rabbi allowing Jews to use peas and beans in place of matzoth.

It is hard to believe that in this decade, a major world power like the Soviet Union with its nuclear capability and space exploration achievements would stoop to this kind of

they kept together. So he began by false whispers and malicious hints to foment jealousies and distrust among them. This stratagem succeeded so well that ere long the bulls grew cold and unfriendly, and finally avoided each other and fed each one by himself apart. No sooner did the lion see this than he fell upon them one by one and killed them in turn.

"Moral: The quarrels of friends are the opportunities of foes."

Conservationists who fight among themselves may win battles—but they will lose the war.

This is my considered judgment as an interested citizen and a Member of the Congress who constantly deals with conservation legislation. Your opponents like nothing better than to see conservationists bloody each others' noses.

Why do you fight among yourselves? Why do you waste your strength on internal struggles?

Let's face it. People who belong to conservation groups—and you are one of them—are far outnumbered by the million who couldn't care less. In spite of these odds, you can be heard, and you can get things done. But if you aren't all on the same side of major issues, and aren't well-enough organized to drive your point home, you don't stand a chance. Railroad spikes aren't driven with tack hammers.

And by you, I mean you both as an individual and as a member of your organization.

Members of the Congress usually know what people think. We hear constantly from folks back home about every subject under the sun. Sometimes, general opinion jells and things happen. However, when opinions are badly splintered, nothing happens—nothing good, at least.

A good example of a bad job by well-meaning conservationists is the duck story. The great flights of ducks and geese which thrilled us in spring and fall are dwindling. The situation has been critical now for several years. Why? The wetlands needed by these magnificent birds were—and are—going. And where have the conservationists been? Birdwatchers have been fighting hunters. Hunters have been fighting each other—and game commissions about bag limits and lengths of open seasons.

Hunters, birders, game biologists, sporting goods manufacturers, outdoor writers—all rallied to "save the ducks." But, while they argued among themselves on what to save them for, the battle was lost—lost to the real villains: Federal subsidies, agricultural drainage experts, real estate developers, water polluters, and so forth.

By the time conservationists began working together to preserve some of that disappearing habitat, it was too late. Poor flights made poor hunting. Poor hunting resulted in poor duck stamp sales. Funds for habitat preservation, earmarked from duck stamp sales income, didn't materialize. Congress authorized a loan of \$105 million against future stamp sales, but has actually appropriated only \$17 million of it. And the draining, filling, and pollution still goes on and on.

There is too much to be done for conservationists who believe in preservation and wise use of our natural resources to bicker among themselves. Our Pacific salmon are dwindling, our wilderness disappearing. Everything from trout streams to redwoods are being sacrificed to road builders. Litter and billboards clutter our highways and byways. Water pollution is reaching new, and dangerous, levels. There are a dozen major issues, and a hundred small (but no less important) ones before us.

To lick them, we must quit pulling at cross

purposes. Soil conservationists want to reclaim prairie wetlands; duck hunters want to save them. Tree lovers spray poisons to protect their trees \* \* \* and in so doing kill birds. Congress is not above reproach; we authorize expenditures for conservation, but sometimes fail to appropriate the money.

We'll lose our outdoor heritage for sure, unless that interested minority learn to pull together—and in the right direction.

It works. Perhaps the first good example of group conservation action overcoming legislative inertia was the American Buffalo Society's successful fight to save the vanishing bison. It established the refuges and herds that saved the species from extinction. Other historic successes include the Audubon Society's work to save the egrets and eagles. Several State groups have won their fights to create nonpolitical conservation agencies.

Conservation groups have united to purchase lands to protect the Key deer, prairie chickens, waterfowl and other endangered wildlife. They have bought lands for parks, forests and unique ecological areas. Women's organizations, health associations, and civic groups have been invited to join in supporting bond issues to clean up polluted waters.

Coordination is the key. Your own National Wildlife Federation makes outstanding efforts, sponsoring national conferences and other forums.

The antilitter campaign is a fine example of successful coordination between conservationists, civic groups, and the packaging industry.

Should not this approach be equally successful in wilderness preservation? In water pollution control? In providing waterfowl habitat?

One of the most intriguing case histories of conservation frustration is the attempt to establish a national wilderness preservation program. For at least 7 years now, this proposal has undergone a series of refinements. Since these bills apply only to lands already owned by the Federal Government, in some classification of wilderness, cost was not a factor. Yet, not until conservation and resource groups got together did the wilderness bill move.

It was passed by the Senate in the 87th and 88th Congresses. But continued opposition from some commercial interests, using highly skilled professionals, has thus far kept the House from voting on it. Are conservationists still united? Your opponents are.

No Government official likes to be "pressured." But coordinated public opinion can help stop mining on a wildlife sanctuary, the construction of roads through wilderness, or dams on a stream. Organization is the key.

Many conservation battles are fought in the legislative halls, and nowhere is the united front more important.

If you have a pet project, get a responsible organization to draft a proposal, backed up with facts. Get a sponsor in your State legislature or in Congress who is interested enough to see it through. When the bill has been introduced and referred to a committee, let your legislator know that you want action.

I know that conservationists essentially are individualists. They resist organization and discipline. They argue among themselves about everything from bass lures to methods of controlling the use of pesticides. But when the chips are down, it's time to put aside minor differences and unite on the major issues—or nothing will get done.

The late President Kennedy observed: "United there is little we cannot do; divided, there is little we can do." Let this be your guiding principle.

(A former park ranger, Mr. DINGELL (Michigan) is one of the House of Representatives outstanding conservationists.)

April 7

petty but cruel and repressive official harassment of a helpless minority. Against such calculated disrespect for elementary human rights as well as for world opinion, there must be general and universal protest.

The fact that the Soviet regime listens was shown when the Soviet official news agency Tass reported a partial recantation of the scandalous and libelous anti-Semitic book published in Kiev under the title "Judaism Without Embellishment." The Kremlin's leaders should be made aware that a great wave of indignation from all parts of the world is rising up over the Soviet Union's continued campaign of anti-Jewish repression.

All of us must here resolve that we will not remain silent or permit the world to remain silent while the scope and intensity of Soviet actions against the Jewish minority grows and becomes more deliberate.

In the name of humanity not only our voices but the voices of free men and women everywhere as well must be raised above the Iron Curtain in protest.

This conference must demand that the Soviet Union halt these oppressive acts forthwith and restore to Jews the elementary human rights to practice their religion, to be free of discrimination and to rejoin their families in other lands.

There is no doubt that the Soviet Union is very sensitive to charges of anti-Semitism. The Communists pride themselves on the law which makes anti-Semitism a criminal offense. Indeed, they tried to deny its existence when the poet Yevtushenko published his famous poem "Babi Yar" as a protest against Russian anti-Semitism. But when 89 out of 163 sentenced to death by Soviet courts between July 1961 and October 1963 for alleged economic crimes—almost 60 percent—are publicly reported to be Jews and their names are held up for ridicule and contempt in the official Soviet press; when the Soviet regime closes down synagogues and Jewish cemeteries; crushes every vestige of Jewish culture and deports Jews to Kazakhstan while simultaneously telling the outside world that Jews enjoy religious freedom; and when there is distributed an officially published edition of 12,000 copies of the blatantly anti-Semitic book by Trofim Klokho, entitled "Judaism Without Embellishment," under the auspices of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences—then it is time to rip off the false mask from the Soviet claim that there is no "Jewish question" under communism and to expose the hypocrisy behind official denial of anti-Jewish actions. The Kremlin would like us to believe that anti-Jewish repressive acts are cold war lies spread by capitalists and imperialists, but the facts give this explanation the lie.

I have asked the Soviet authorities to explain why there is such a sharp difference between the way Jews are described in Soviet publications for external distribution and the way they are vilified and made objects of suspicion in books and periodicals distributed inside the U.S.S.R. The crude racist hate-mongering of the Kichko book has brought forth protests even from Communists themselves in France, Italy and the United States who have condemned its Hitlerite propaganda and called for its suppression.

In the Soviet press for the first time, the Jewish nationality of the accused in the show trials is openly flaunted. This was not done even under Stalin with his "Doctors' Plot" when Jews were identified only through euphemisms like cosmopolitans, and the shock and significance of this departure from Communist ideological practice has not been lost on Jews. Add to all this the fact that propaganda against Israel has been stepped up, and you can readily appreciate the mounting fears of Jews the world over for the safety of our coreligionists in the U.S.S.R.

Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders from time to time have tried to insist that Soviet

treatment of religious minorities is an internal matter and that protests constitute interference in the Soviet Union's domestic affairs. Over a century ago, the U.S. Government provided an answer to this kind of rebuttal, and formulated a policy that remains valid to this day.

Since 1840, the United States, while recognizing the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of another state, nevertheless has protested the persecution of oppressed minorities by foreign governments and justified these protests in the name of our moral duty toward humanity. The United States has done so alone and also in concert with other nations. Our country has never been silent in the face of persecution.

We have lodged these protests and registered our disapproval in a variety of ways, among them, through direct communication to the governments concerned, by recalling the U.S. diplomatic representative for consultation, by direct references in the President's annual message to the Congress, by the termination of a commercial treaty, and by the use of indirect acts such as joining in multilateral acts of disapproval as a means of protest.

The list of such protests on behalf of Jews is long and honorable. In 1840 the United States condemned the persecution of Jews in Damascus.

In 1870 we urged the Ottoman government to halt the killing of Jews in Rumania.

In 1877 the United States granted protection to Russian Jews settled in or near Jerusalem, and emphasized that "the sympathy of the United States for all oppressed peoples in foreign countries has been freely manifested in all cases where it could be done in accordance with the spirit of international courtesy and diplomatic usage."

In the next two decades the United States protested no fewer than nine times against the Czarist Russian Government's repressive acts and persecution of Jews. These protests, backed by the American people and by resolutions of the Congress culminated in 1911 when President Taft terminated the treaty of commerce with Russia which had been in effect since 1832. President Taft took this action over the advice of the State Department which warned that abrogation of the treaty would have serious effects on the Nation's commercial relations with the Russian Empire in addition to larger political considerations.

The United States has protested action against Jews by Rumania, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Italy, and Poland. The record of U.S. protests to the Nazi government should still be fresh in our minds. Secretary Cordell Hull recorded in his memoirs that "I found myself calling in the German Ambassador time after time to protest against violations of the rights of our citizens, against persecution of the Jews, and against mistreatment of Americans by Nazi bullies."

No policy is more firmly fixed in the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs than this moral imperative to come to the aid of oppressed peoples. American public opinion must be roused to the danger that this Soviet campaign presents not only to Jews—though they are the first victims—but to all religious minorities in the U.S.S.R. Moscow has every reason to be concerned over the bad name that its anti-Jewish policy is creating for it in the world, and our protest must be intensified in every way possible. Only then will we be able to convince the Kremlin that the price it must pay for its anti-Jewish policy is too high and too costly in terms of its international image.

This is no time for counsels of caution and fear—or of silence—on the part of American Jewry. Each great wave of indignation will serve to ultimately alleviate, and will help prevent aggravation of the plight of the Jews in the Soviet Union. Each protest by

individuals, by organizations, and by the free nations of the world will serve to make the Kremlin realize how sterile and harmful is its anti-Jewish policy.

## Private Power Gets Subsidy

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1964

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, once again we are seeing an example of the Machiavellian activities of the private power combines. Consistent with their position of nearly one-half a century, an important element of the so-called investor-owned utilities, better known as the IOU's, the Idaho Power Co. is doing everything it can to stir up uninformed opposition to the extension of the Bonneville Power Administration into southwestern Idaho and southeastern Oregon.

The IOU's are very fond of pointing to themselves as great examples of free enterprise. Walter Wells, of the Oregon State group, writing in the Oregon Grange Bulletin of April 6, makes an excellent statement which points out the real position of private power companies in comparison to true free enterprise. Mr. Wells's article is included at this point:

**PRIVATE POWER GETS SUBSIDY—COMPETITION LACK, HIGH RATES PROTECT MONOPOLIES IN STATE**

(By Walter Wells)

Private power companies spend millions of dollars of the ratepayers' money advertising in local papers and national magazines to convince the reading public that they have a free enterprise, business managed, tax-paying operation.

Actually they have the special privilege of an exclusive franchise and monopoly granted by the city and State and have no competition at all in most areas they serve.

This, in effect, is a very valuable subsidy they enjoy, because the State law allows them to set rates high enough to earn 5 percent on their investment and almost all money they have ever put into the system is still on their books for ratemaking, even the money spent for lines and equipment now obsolete and no longer in use.

**DEBTS STAY ON BOOKS**

Private power companies almost never reduce their indebtedness and their electric consumers will always be paying rates based on this high value, yet they will never have any measure of control and will always have to buy from an exclusive monopoly.

Is this free enterprise? No.

Public power systems require and have the best business management, because they have lower rates, and out of their income they pay interest on their investments, pay Bonneville or some other source for their electric energy.

They hire their employees from the same unions as does the private power company and pay the same wages.

Each year they pay on their bonded indebtedness, and as the debt is paid off, lower rates for electricity will follow since public power systems are in business not to make a profit but to serve their electric users at the lowest possible rates.